

Executive Summary

A review of TRW Study Report 94-8 identifies a number of areas where additional information would be very useful. The report modifies some of the objectives of the Task Assignment. Process improvement was discussed, but specific processes that could be streamlined were not identified. In discussing recommendations for improving efficiency in plans, procedures, and standards, most of the recommended changes concerned documentation and CDRLs. We suggest that additional analysis be done. Finally, the assignment to identify areas for consideration during funding restrictions was not addressed at all.

1.0 CUP REPORT 94-8 REVIEW

1.1 Background

The text for Task Assignment 94-8 reads as follows:

Analysis of Management Plans

The contractor shall review the baseline management and development processes and make recommendations for changes to plans, procedures, standards, etc. that would improve efficiency. The contractor shall also identify areas for consideration during funding restrictions.

1.2 Objective

Some results of Task Order 94-8 are contained in a report (TRW 2700 94-8) dated October 28, 1994. The following analysis is intended to (a) describe the extent to which all elements of the Task Assignment have been addressed, (b) present questions concerning points that needed clarification, and (c) offer useful suggestions.

1.3 Analysis

Specific Comments:

- It appears that the objectives of the task were somewhat redefined. Task assignment No. 94-8 states that the contractor should make recommendations for changes to “plans, procedures, standards, etc.” that would improve efficiency. However, the objectives listed on p. 4 state that the contractor should recommend changes to improve efficiency
 - ◊ in generating and maintaining program documentation and
 - ◊ in processes.

It is not clear why the original objectives were changed.

- Process improvement, according to p. 7, can occur by streamlining certain processes. It would be useful if candidate processes were identified.
- Another method of process improvement (p. 7) is to use COTS software to automate selected processes. Again, it would be nice if candidate processes were identified. It would also be useful to know what types of COTS software were being considered.

- In order to eliminate the Contractor Standards and Procedures Handbook (CDRL A132), it is necessary to modify CDRLs A131, A141, A161, B001, and B007. Is it really worth changing so many CDRLs just so that one can be eliminated? The cost trade-offs were not presented.
- Why is briefing format recommended in some cases (p. 18, 19, proposal for B003, B006, B201, B202)? Usually that format conveys less information.
- Why is the Detailed Requirements Verification Matrix identical to the System Requirements Verification Matrix (p. 20)?
- Page 21 appears to be identical to page 20 except for one word in the title.
- The report needs to identify areas for consideration during funding restrictions. This has not yet been done even though it is part of the task assignment.

1.4 Conclusions

Not all objectives of Task Order 94-8 have been satisfied in the report. The following table summarizes the areas where additional information is needed.

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>More information needed?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review the baseline management and development processes	Some
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In order to improve efficiency, make recommendations for changes to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">◊ plans◊ procedures◊ standards◊ other	Most of the recommended changes concerned documentation and CDRLs; more is needed
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify areas for consideration during funding restrictions	Yes; this was not addressed at all